The Statistical Equivalence of Large-scale Structure

Xin Wang
*Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, 60 St. George St., Toronto, ON, M5H 3H8, Canada**
(Dated: December 20, 2016)

In the study of the large-scale structure (LSS), it is challenging to describe all relevant physical processes, so it is appealing to develop some effective approach that best represents the original system. Particularly, since we are only interested in the statistical properties instead of specific realizations in LSS, with a given evolution history of the probability density function (PDF), there could exist alternative dynamical system that obeys the exact same PDF evolution, which we will name as the statistical equivalence principle. This PDF equation is expressed as a kinetic theory of all relevant degree of freedoms, and as a first order partial differential equation, it could be solved by the method of characteristics. In this paper, we show that these characteristic curves would lead to a theory quite similar to the well-studied effective field theory (EFT) of LSS. Unlike the EFT of LSS, which conceptually would work at realization level, our equivalent dynamics is valid only statistically. In this formula, the small-scale influence is expressed as the ensemble average of their interactions conditional on the large-scale modes. By applying the Gram-Charlier expansion, we demonstrate a different structure of the effective counter terms. Our formalism is a natural framework for discussing the evolution of statistical properties of large-scale modes, and provides an alternative view for understanding the relationship between general effective dynamics and standard perturbation theory.

arXiv:1612.05995v1 [astro-ph.CO] 18 Dec 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The large-scale structure contains valuable information of our Universe, including the evolution history, composition and primordial physics, which can be extracted from statistical measurement of observed samples. Consequently, the study of LSS has largely been focusing on understanding the statistical properties of various cosmic fields [1, 2]. Due to the gravitational non-linearity, these fields become non-Gaussian at later time almost regardless of their initial conditions. The same non-linearity also complicates the theoretical calculation of these quantities, e.g. via the perturbation theory (PT) [1–5]. The standard perturbation theory does not converge at non-linear scales after these quantities , e.g. the density contrast δ, become non-perturbative [6]. Numerical simulation is certainly the most powerful and reliable tool in these regimes, but the computational cost is still the bottleneck for practical application to cosmological constraints at this moment, although attempts have been made to accelerate the calculation [7, 8]. In addition, it provides less physical insights than analytical studies. Therefore, as the existing and upcoming large-scale surveys require higher and higher accuracy for describing the statistics of LSS, enormous efforts have been made to achieve this goal. In Eulerian space, the renormalized perturbation theory (RPT) [6, 9–11] and its general extension, i.e. the Gamma expansion [12], has been shown to obtain reasonable accuracy with modest numerical cost [10, 13]. In Lagrangian space, some resummation techniques have also been developed [14, 15] and further improved to incorporate redshift distortion, clustering bias and non-Gaussian initial conditions [16–19]. However, even with so many sophisticated techniques, the agreement with simulation is still not satisfactory [20]. Moreover, despite valuable physical insights PRT and related approaches have provided, they are not perfect for calculating equal time correlation as they violate Galilean invariance, and result in only a partial resummation of large-scale modes, whose effect is cancelled in a more systematic treatment [21, 22].

Recently, there has been some new developments adopting the effective field theory (EFT) in the large-scale structure calculation [23–26]. Subsequently, many authors have applied this approach to various calculations, e.g. in Eulerian space [27–29], in Lagrangian space [30], with ressumation [31], bispectrum [32, 33], biased tracer [34] etc. Unlike the traditional perturbation theory, it accepts the existence of some finite practically unreachable non-linear scale of PT. After picking up some smaller cut-off scale that defines a subset of more manageable large-scale modes, this approach attempts to systematically incorporate little-known small-scale information by introducing an effective stress energy tensor with calibratable parameters. The hope is that by introducing these effective terms, one would not only be able to capture small-scale nonlinear mode couplings, but also the shell-crossing effects that previous perturbative calculation did not even try to address from the beginning. In this sense, it is probably fair to say a *complete* fluid-like theory of the large-scale structure *must* be effective.

However, regardless of the efforts that have been made, there still seems to lack a critical look at the statistical side of the methodology itself. Particularly, likely due to the involvement of quantum field theory jargon, it is not clear to what extent the systematical introduction of those counter-terms would guarantee the recovery of the statistical information of the original dynamical system. For example, do well-calibrated counter-terms for

* xwang@cita.utoronto.ca



FIG. 1. Illustration of statistical equivalence, where two different dynamical systems, shown as trajectories on the floor, could have identical PDF evolution history for a set of dynamical variables $\mathcal{O}^{(n)} = \{\mathbf{\Psi}^{(1)} \cdots \mathbf{\Psi}^{(n)}\}$. Often, e.g. in large-scale structure, $\mathcal{O}^{(n)}$ is not sufficient to determine the time evolution of individual trajectory, which then appears stochastic, and the initial condition $\mathcal{O}^{(n)}(\tau_0)$ is not sufficient to uniquely determine its evolution. This could be described by the transition PDF defined in equation (9), and is shown as shaded region on the left around some arbitrary trajectory. On the *right*, we show a statistically equivalent dynamical system, where the trajectories are the projected characteristic curves of the PDF evolution equation. As shown in equation (6 - 8), these curves define the mean probability current in $\mathcal{O}^{(n)}$ space.

power spectrum automatically assure the convergence of bispectrum and multi-points polyspectrum? Or what is the general relation between the coefficients fixed by direct measurement in the realization and by matching the statistics, without explicit examination at every order? It is hard to give a general answer without any guidance.

Generally speaking, probably all physical models we have ever built could be considered as effective to some extent, as lots of original dynamical degree-of-freedoms have to be neglected to reduce the complexity of the problem. For LSS, since we are only interested in the statistics of those cosmic fields, constructing an effective theory of LSS basically comes down to the fitting of some specific statistical measurements. There has been some similar situations in cosmology, for example the excursion set theory of halo mass function [35, 36], where we have dramatically simplified the much more complicated physical process to a stochastic first-crossing problem only for recovering the statistics, i.e. the mass function.

From the perspective of LSS, the most comprehensive statistics one would ever need is the joint probability distribution function of large-scale modes.[1] Practically, however, only a couple of lower order moments of this PDF, e.g. the power spectrum and bispectrum, are accessible. Nevertheless, at least formally, one is still able to write down the time evolution equation of this PDF as the kinetic theory of generalized dynamics [37–39]. Furthermore, since only one constraint for those enormous numbers of degree-of-freedoms is being applied, i.e. this PDF evolution equation itself, there could exist alternative dynamical systems that would reproduce this statistical information *exactly*. In the following, we will call this property as the *statistic equivalence* (SE). These alternative dynamics would always have identical joint PDF as original system, and quite naturally would serve as an *effective theory* for our purpose.

In section II, we will write down the kinetic theory for general dynamical system and introduce the concept of statistical equivalence. After reviewing the cosmic dynamics for large-scale structure in section III, we investigate our effective theory first for the pressureless fluid model in section IV, neglecting vorticity and velocity dispersion. Then in section V, we try to extend to include the orbit crossing and finally conclude in section VI.

II. THE KINETIC THEORY OF GENERAL DYNAMICS

For a Newtonian N-particle system, the probability density function in $6N$ dimensional phase space is conserved and described by the Liouville theory, and a integration over parts of variables leads to the so-called BBGKY hierarchy, where the equation of n particles probability density function would depend on $n+1$ particles probability density function. Generally, for an arbitrary dynamical system, where individual dynamical degree of freedom, or *a mode*, $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathcal{O}_\psi = \{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}_1} \cdots \boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}_i} \cdots\}$, is described by a first order differential equation, i.e.

$$\partial_\tau \boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}}(\tau) = \boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mathbf{k}}[\boldsymbol{\psi}; \tau], \tag{1}$$

one could also derive similar kinetic theory for the PDF of $\mathcal{O}_\psi$. Here the set $\mathcal{O}_\psi$ includes all dynamical variables

[1] under the assumption that this PDF does exist, see section IV for further discussion.

one is interested in, and we have also labelled different variables by some vector $\mathbf{k}$. As will be seen later, we do assume $\mathbf{k}$ is a discrete label set. In general, the source term $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{\mathbf{k}}[\boldsymbol{\psi};\tau]$ is a non-linear and non-local function of $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ and even some other unknown variables. By non-local, we mean it could depend on the value of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ at different $\mathbf{k}$.

Now consider an ensemble of such systems, and we are interested in the evolution of the N-point PDF of a subset of variables $\mathcal{O}_{\psi}^{(n)} = \{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}_1}\cdots\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}_n}\}$. The ensemble here does depend on the problem itself, for example, in [39], it is a sample of Lagrangian fluid elements, or equivalently the density weighted field in Eulerian space, but here we assume it is different realizations of our Universe. For a single realization, the probability density function, i.e. the fine-grained PDF is described by the products of Dirac-δ functions

$$\mathcal{P}_f^{(n)}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right] = \prod_{i\leq n}\delta_D\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}_i}(\tau)\right], \quad (2)$$

where we have denoted $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)} = \{\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1)},\cdots,\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(n)}\}$, and $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)}$ is the sample space variable corresponds to $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}_i}$. By definition, the PDF of the ensemble could be obtained by taking average of the fined-grained PDF, i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right] = \left\langle \mathcal{P}_f^{(n)}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right]\right\rangle. \quad (3)$$

To proceed, one takes the time derivative of $\mathcal{P}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\tau\mathcal{P}^{(n)} &= \left\langle\partial_\tau\mathcal{P}_f^{(n)}\right\rangle = \sum_i\left\langle\left[\partial_\tau\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}_i}^{(i)}(\tau)\right]\partial_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(i)}}\mathcal{P}_f^{(n)}\right\rangle\\ &= -\sum_i\partial_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)}}\left[\left\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}},\tau)\mathcal{P}_f^{(n)}\right\rangle\right], \quad (4)\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have changed derivative with respect to dynamical variables $\partial_{\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(i)}}$ to the one with respect to the sample space variables $\partial_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)}}$. In the case where the source term $\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}$ is a m-th order nonlinear function of $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}}$, the average $\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_f^{(n)}\rangle$ could then depend on $\mathcal{P}^{(n+1)}\cdots\mathcal{P}^{(n+m)}$, similar to the BBGKY hierarchy where $m=1$. Hence, we have a hierarchy of the time evolution equation for $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$

$$\partial_\tau\mathcal{P}^{(n)} = \sum_{i=n}^{n+m}\mathcal{L}^{(i)}\mathcal{P}^{(i)}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{(i)}$ is some operator corresponding to the i-point PDF $\mathcal{P}^{(i)}$. In order to close this hierarchy, we could at least formally express the right hand side of equation (4) in terms of conditional average, so eventually one has a continuity equation of $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$ [37, 38]

$$\partial_\tau\mathcal{P}^{(n)} + \sum_i\partial_{\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)}}\left[\left\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}\middle|\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right\rangle\mathcal{P}^{(n)}\right] = 0. \quad (6)$$

So as long as one could know *in advance* the averaged $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ given the constraints of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)}$, this is a closed partial differential equation of $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}$.

In practice, it would be almost impossible to solve equation (6) given its high dimensionality. However, as a first order partial differential equation (PDE), one could apply the so-called method of characteristic to reduce the problem into a group of ordinary differential equations. Applying the standard procedure of this approach, the characteristic trajectory of ith mode reads

$$\partial_\tau\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)}(\mathbf{k}_i,\tau) = \left\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}\middle|\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right\rangle, \quad 1\leq i\leq n, \quad (7)$$

where we have expressed the equation with the sample space variable as they being the solution to equation (6). On the right plot of FIG. (1), we illustrate the procedure for obtaining these effective trajectories. As integrated trajectories that fully represents the hypersurface of the PDE solution of (6), these characteristic curves would perfectly serve as an alternative effective dynamics, since they would always reproduce the same statistics as the original system. In other words, with the same set of initial conditions of $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)}(\tau_0)$, both dynamical systems (1) and (7) would deliver the same $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau)$. This could be verified simply by re-deriving the equation (6) from the effective dynamics (7).

The physical meaning of these trajectories becomes much clearer when we further define the *probability current* along $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)}$ direction in the continuity equation (6) as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{j}_{\mathcal{P}}^{(i)} &= \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{P}}^{(i)}\mathcal{P}^{(n)} = \partial_\tau\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(i)}\mathcal{P}^{(n)}\\ &= \left\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}\middle|\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right\rangle\mathcal{P}^{(n)}. \quad (8)\end{aligned}$$

So for a deterministic system whose dynamics is fully described by these n variables, the current is simply the original dynamical equations (1). However, if $\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}$ depends on variables other than $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(1\cdots n)}$, equation (7) then characterizes the averaged flow of the probability density function marginalizing over all other variables. Consequently, as already shown in [39], these characteristic trajectories are not necessarily the same as the real dynamic evolution.

To better understand the difference between characteristic trajectories and the original dynamics, it is helpful to consider the transition probability density, which is defined as the conditional probability of $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(1\cdots n)}$ for given an initial state $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)}$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{T}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)}\middle|\boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)}\right] = \frac{\mathcal{P}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)},\boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)}\right]}{\mathcal{P}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)}\right]}. \quad (9)$$

The PDF at epoch τ could then be expressed as an integral over all possible initial condition

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right] = \int\left(\mathcal{D}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{(1\ldots n)}\right)\ \mathcal{P}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)};\tau_0\right]\\ \times\ \mathcal{T}\left[\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\middle|\boldsymbol{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)};\tau_0\right]. \quad (10)\end{aligned}$$

Again, in many cases, we are only interested in a subset of dynamical variables. So in the original dynamical

system, e.g. left plot of FIG. (1), a given initial condition $\mathbf{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)}$ would not fully determine the trajectory. Instead, depending on the distribution of remaining degree-of-freedoms, the transition probability $\mathcal{T}$ would generally be broadened, shown as shaded region in FIG. (1). Particularly, in large-scale structure, such broadening as a function of Fourier wavenumber $\mathbf{k}$, is then related to the so-called non-linear propagator [6, 9]. On the other hand, the effective characteristic trajectories are deterministic in the sense that $\mathcal{T}$ is simply δ_D functions. The statistical equivalence could then be translated as the existence of multiple $\mathcal{T}\left[\mathbf{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)}\middle|\mathbf{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)}\right]$ for given initial distribution $\mathcal{P}\left[\mathbf{\Psi}_0^{(1\cdots n)}\right]$ and final $\mathcal{P}\left[\mathbf{\Psi}^{(1\cdots n)};\tau\right]$.

Notice that all our discussions in this section only describe the kinetic of the system instead of dynamics. It is merely a expression of the conservation of the probability once the statistical information is provided for all relevant degree of freedoms we have accounted for. Also, we would like to mention that the derivation until equation (4) does *not* necessarily suggest the effective dynamic is deterministic, and therefore one might not be able to apply the method of characteristics, we will come back to this in section V.

III. COSMIC DYNAMICS

The non-relativistic collisionless cold dark matter is described by the single-particle phase space density $f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p},\tau)$, which obeys the Vlasov equation [2]

$$\partial_\tau f + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{ma}\cdot\nabla f - am\nabla\Phi\cdot\boldsymbol{\partial}_p f = 0, \tag{11}$$

where τ here is the conformal time, $a(\tau)$ is the scale factor, m is the mass of the dark matter, $\mathbf{p} = am\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ is the momentum of the particle, and Φ is gravitational potential. In Newtonian cosmology, Φ is determined by the Poisson equation

$$\nabla^2\Phi = 4\pi G\bar{\rho}a^2\delta, \tag{12}$$

where G is the gravitational constant, $\delta = \rho/\bar{\rho} - 1$ is the density contrast, and $\bar{\rho}(\tau)$ the average density.

In order to avoid solving this $(6+1)$-dimensional non-linear partial differential equation, one instead takes the zeroth and first order moments of velocity to get the continuity and Euler equation

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\tau\delta + \nabla_i\left[(1+\delta)u_i\right] &= 0,\\ \partial_\tau u_i + (u_j\nabla_j)u_i + \mathcal{H}u_i &= -\nabla_i\Phi - \pi_i,\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{u}$ is the peculiar velocity, and $\mathcal{H}(\tau) = d\ln a/d\tau$. We have also included the contribution from the second moments of $f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p},\tau)$, which is related to the velocity dispersion σ_{ij}^u

$$\rho\sigma_{ij}^u = \int d^3\mathbf{p}\ \frac{p_i p_j}{a^2m^2}f(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{p},\tau) - \rho u_i u_j, \tag{14}$$

via the relation

$$\pi_i = \frac{1}{\rho}(\nabla_j\rho\sigma_{ij}^u). \tag{15}$$

In the so-called dust model, this term is usually neglected. Decomposing the peculiar velocity $\mathbf{u}$ into divergent θ and rotational part $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, the evolution equation could be expressed in Fourier space

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\eta\delta(\mathbf{k}) - \theta(\mathbf{k}) &= \alpha(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\theta(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta(\mathbf{k}_2)\\ &\quad + \alpha_i^\omega(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\omega_i(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta(\mathbf{k}_2)\\ \partial_\eta\theta(\mathbf{k}) + (g-1)\theta(\mathbf{k}) - g\delta(\mathbf{k}) &= \beta(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\theta(\mathbf{k}_1)\theta(\mathbf{k}_2)\\ &\quad +\beta_i^\omega(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\omega_i(\mathbf{k}_1)\theta(\mathbf{k}_2) + \beta_{ij}^{\omega^2}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\\ &\quad \times\omega_i(\mathbf{k}_1)\omega_j(\mathbf{k}_2) + \pi_\theta(\mathbf{k})\\ \partial_\eta\omega_i(\mathbf{k}) + (g-1)\omega_i(\mathbf{k}) &= \kappa_{ij}^\omega(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\omega_j(\mathbf{k}_1)\theta(\mathbf{k}_2)\\ &\quad +\kappa_{ijk}^{\omega^2}\omega_j(\mathbf{k}_1)\omega_k(\mathbf{k}_2) + \pi_{\omega,i}(\mathbf{k}).\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $g = 3\Omega_m/(2f^2) \approx 3/2$. Here the new time variable η is introduced as $d\eta = d\ln D(\tau)$, and $D(\tau)$ is the linear growth rate. We have also rescaled the velocity $u_i \to -\mathcal{H}fu_i$, and $\pi_i \to (\mathcal{H}f)^2\pi_i$. Notice that besides the standard kernel

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \delta_D(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_{12})\frac{(\mathbf{k}_{12}\cdot\mathbf{k}_1)}{k_1^2},\\ \beta(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \delta_D(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_{12})\frac{k_{12}^2(\mathbf{k}_1\cdot\mathbf{k}_2)}{2k_1^2k_2^2},\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbf{k}_{12} = \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2$, we have also introduced some extra contributions that arises from the coupling between the vorticity $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and δ or θ. In details, these kernels could be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_i^\omega(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \delta_D(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_{12})\frac{(\mathbf{k}_1\times\mathbf{k}_2)_i}{k_1^2}\\ \beta_i^\omega(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \delta_D(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_{12})\frac{2\mathbf{k}_1\cdot\mathbf{k}_2 + k_2^2}{k_1^2k_2^2}(\mathbf{k}_1\times\mathbf{k}_2)_i\\ \beta_{ij}^{\omega^2}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \delta_D(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_{12})\frac{(\mathbf{k}_2\times\mathbf{k}_1)_i(\mathbf{k}_1\times\mathbf{k}_2)_j}{k_1^2k_2^2}\\ \kappa_{ij}^\omega(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \delta_D(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_{12})\frac{(\mathbf{k}_{12}\cdot\mathbf{k}_2)\delta_{ij} - k_{2i}k_{2j}}{k_2^2}\\ \kappa_{ijk}^{\omega^2}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \delta_D(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_{12})\frac{\epsilon_{ilk}k_{2j}k_{2l} - (\mathbf{k}_1\times\mathbf{k}_2)_k\delta_{ij}}{k_2^2},\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

ϵ_{ijk} is the Levi-Civita symbol. And we have also decomposed the $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ into two parts, $\pi_\theta = \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\omega = \nabla\times\boldsymbol{\pi}$. Obviously equation set (16) is not closed, as no equation of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is provided. Usually, an attempt to do so would either leads to an infinite hierarchy or some arbitrary truncation. In the standard model, assuming potential flow initial condition, the vorticity would not be generated without the source term $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\omega$, which is guaranteed by Kelvin's circulation theorem.

As demonstrated in section II, we are seeking a statistical closure of this dynamics. Since we are not particularly interested in the evolution of vorticity itself, we

will only consider it as some extra source term similar to $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. Defining the dynamical vector for matter field as $\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{k}) = \{\delta(\mathbf{k}), \theta(\mathbf{k})\}$, one could express equation (13) in a compact form [2]

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ab}\psi_b(\mathbf{k}) = &\gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\psi_b(\mathbf{k}_1)\psi_c(\mathbf{k}_2) + \gamma^{\omega}_{aib}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\\ &\times\omega_i(\mathbf{k}_1)\psi_b(\mathbf{k}_2) + \gamma^{\omega^2}_{aij}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\omega_i(\mathbf{k}_1)\omega_j(\mathbf{k}_2)\\ &+\pi_a(\mathbf{k}),\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where index $a, b, c \in \{1, 2\}$, and i, j are spatial indices of vectors. The linear operator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ab}$ is defined as

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ab} = \partial_\eta\delta_{ab} + \Omega_{ab}, \tag{20}$$

and the coefficient matrix Ω_{ab} equals

$$\Omega_{ab} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -g & g-1 \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -3/2 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{21}$$

The mode coupling vertex $\gamma_{abs}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)$ is nonzero only at

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{121}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \alpha(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)/2,\\ \gamma_{112}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \alpha(\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_1)/2,\\ \gamma_{222}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \beta(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2),\\ \gamma^{\omega}_{1i1}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \alpha^{\omega}_i(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2),\\ \gamma^{\omega}_{2i2}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \beta^{\omega}_i(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2),\\ \gamma^{\omega^2}_{2ij}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) &= \beta^{\omega^2}_{ij}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2).\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

And finally we define $\pi_a(\mathbf{k}, \eta) = \{0, \pi_\theta(\mathbf{k})\}$.

In the standard pressureless perfect fluid (or dust model), which we neglect both $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ terms, one could formally express the nonlinear solution as [2, 6, 9]

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_a(\mathbf{k},\eta) = g_{ab}(\eta)\phi_b(\mathbf{k}) + \int_0^\eta ds\ g_{ab}(\eta-s)\gamma_{bcd}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\\ \times\ \psi_c(\mathbf{k}_1,s)\psi_d(\mathbf{k}_2,s)\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\phi_a(\mathbf{k}) = \psi_a(\mathbf{k}, \eta_0)$ is initial condition, and the linear propagator $g_{ab}(\eta)$ is

$$g_{ab}(\eta) = \frac{e^\eta}{5}\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 3 & 2 \end{bmatrix} - \frac{e^{-3\eta/2}}{5}\begin{bmatrix} -2 & 2 \\ 3 & -3 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{24}$$

The growing initial condition is $\phi_a \propto [1, 1]$, and one notices that $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is invertible as long as we keep both growing and decaying mode. This formal solution leads to simple diagram representation of $\psi_a(\mathbf{k}, \eta)$ [6, 9], which we will adopt in the following of the paper. The standard perturbation series could be expanded as $\psi_a(\mathbf{k}, \eta) = \sum_n \psi^{(n)}_a(\mathbf{k}, \eta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{(n)}_a(\mathbf{k};\eta) = \int_{\mathbf{k}_{1\cdots n}} &\mathcal{F}^{(n)}_{aa_1\cdots a_n}(\mathbf{k}_1,\cdots\mathbf{k}_n;\eta)\\ &\times\ \phi_{a_1}(\mathbf{k}_1)\cdots\phi_{a_n}(\mathbf{k}_n),\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{(n)}_{aa_1\cdots a_n}$ is the SPT kernel. Finally, the power spectrum is defined as

$$\langle\psi_a(\mathbf{k})\psi_b(\mathbf{k}')\rangle_c = \delta_D(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}')P_{ab}(\mathbf{k}), \tag{26}$$

where subscript $_c$ denotes the connected part of the average.

IV. STATISTICALLY EQUIVALENT THEORY OF PRESSURELESS PERFECT FLUID

Applying the method introduced in section II to cosmic dynamical system (16), one would get an statistically effective description of the large-scale structure. In this section, we will first concentrate on the dust model, and then to generalize the concept to include the orbit-crossing in next section. In both cases, we are interested in the statistical evolution of the density contrast δ and peculiar velocity $\mathbf{u}$ field, which is encoded in the joint PDF of δ and $\mathbf{u}$. To avoid dealing with continuous field domain, we consider a finite cosmic volume V, with periodic boundary condition. Therefore, the number of total Fourier modes $\delta(\mathbf{k}_i)$ and $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{k}_i)$ are countable[2]. In practice, however, we will not explicitly distinguish Fourier series and continuous transform in this paper. For example, the Fourier space integration will *not* be replaced by series summation since the difference would be negligible if V becomes large enough.

For many applications, e.g. the baryonic acoustic oscillation (BAO) measurement, not all Fourier modes are equally interesting. Consequently, one could select some cutoff scale Λ, and only concentrate on a finite subset of Fourier modes with $k < \Lambda$. In the following, we will denote this set of large-scale modes (or soft modes) and its complement (hard-modes) as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\psi}_\Lambda &= \{\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{k})\}_{k<\Lambda}, \quad \boldsymbol{\psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}} = \{\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{k})\}_{k>\Lambda};\\ \boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda &= \{\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{k})\}_{k<\Lambda}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}} = \{\boldsymbol{\Psi}(\mathbf{k})\}_{k>\Lambda}\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

respectively. Again, $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ is the sample space variables corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Finally, since our cosmic fields are real, only half of Fourier space is independent, i.e. mode $\boldsymbol{\psi}(-\mathbf{k}) = \boldsymbol{\psi}^*(\mathbf{k})$, therefore we will treat $\boldsymbol{\psi}(-\mathbf{k})$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{k})$ as identical.

Before proceeding, one might have already noticed that, in the linear regime with standard assumption of LSS formation, the density contrast and velocity divergence are simply proportional to each other. Consequently, the Gaussian joint PDF

$$\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\mathbf{k}) \propto \exp[-\Psi_a P^{-1}_{ab}(\mathbf{k})\Psi_b] \tag{28}$$

is not well-defined, since the power spectrum $P_{ab}(\mathbf{k})$ will be singular in this limit. This corresponds to the initial condition (IC) $\phi_a(\mathbf{k}) = \delta_0(\mathbf{k})u_a$, where u_a is some arbitrary constant two-vector. Although we could simply consider only $\delta(\mathbf{k})$ or $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{k})$ itself, the two-component formula would provide much more insight. So instead, we would like to assume a general IC where $\delta_0(\mathbf{k})$ and $\theta_0(\mathbf{k})$ are separate random variables with tiny but non-trivial cross-correlation, i.e.

$$\frac{P_{\delta\theta}}{\sqrt{P_\delta P_\theta}} = 1 + \epsilon, \tag{29}$$

[2] This is only a convenient choice to avoid path-integral in the formalism.

where ϵ is some infinitesimal number. In the following, we will first assume such general non-singular initial condition. As will be seen later, the general feature of our formalism does not really depend on the initial condition, and this is also the case for many, although not all, specific results. There are some situations where the counter-terms have to explicitly take into account the value of P_{ab}^{-1}, we will comment on this in section IV B 3.

A. Effective Dynamics

Neglecting the velocity dispersion π_a and vorticity ω_i, the dynamical system (19) then returns to its standard form

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ab}\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_i} = \gamma^{(i)}_{abc}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}, \tag{30}$$

where we have explicitly denoted the i-th Fourier mode as $\psi_{a,\mathbf{k}_i} = \psi_a(\mathbf{k}_i)$. Following the derivation from section II, the time evolution equation of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta)$ is

$$\partial_\eta\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda) + \sum_{i,a}\partial_{\Psi_a^{(i)}}\Big[\Big\langle\gamma^{(i)}_{abc}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2} - \Omega_{ad}\psi_{d,\mathbf{k}}\,\Big|\,\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\Big\rangle\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda)\Big] = 0, \tag{31}$$

where $\psi_\mathbf{k}\in\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$. The average is made over an ensemble of universes, or different cosmic patches of volume V we assumed initially.

Following the same procedure, the statistically effective trajectories of these modes, i.e. the characteristic curve of the PDF time evolution equation, could be simply expressed as

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ab}\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}} = \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\,\langle\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\rangle\,, \tag{32}$$

where $k<\Lambda$, i.e. $\mathbf{\Psi}(\mathbf{k})\in\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$. We would like to emphasize again that this is the solution to the PDF equation (31), so its PDF $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda)$ will be identical to the original system (30). Since the large-scale modes $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$ themselves could simply be taken out of the conditional average, one naturally separates the quadratic mode coupling terms into two groups

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ab}\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}}(\eta) = \big[\gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}(\eta)\Psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}(\eta)\big]_{\Lambda\Lambda} + \mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta), \tag{33}$$

where the first term $(\gamma\Psi\Psi)_{\Lambda\Lambda}$ denotes that the amplitude of wavenumbers $\mathbf{k}_1$ and $\mathbf{k}_2$ are both less than Λ. The extra contribution $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta)$, i.e. the counterterm (or effective terms), is explicitly expressed as the conditional average of small-small (*hard-hard*) and large-small (*soft-hard*) coupling

$$\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta) = \int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},\widetilde{\Lambda}\Lambda} d\mathbf{k}_{12}\;\gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) \times\;\langle\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta\rangle\,. \tag{34}$$

Here, the integration is taken over the Fourier region where at least one of k_1,k_2 is greater than Λ. Similar to equation (23), the formal solution of $\Psi_a(\mathbf{k},\eta)$ could then be expressed as the linear propagation of source terms at the right hand side of equation (33)

$$\Psi_{a,\mathbf{k}}(\eta) = g_{ab}(\eta)\phi_b(\mathbf{k}) + \int_0^\eta ds\; g_{ab}(\eta-s) \times\big[\gamma_{bcd}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_1}(s)\psi_{d,\mathbf{k}_2}(s)\big]_{\Lambda\Lambda} + \int_0^\eta ds\; g_{ab}(\eta-s)\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;s). \tag{35}$$

To simply the expression, sometimes we will denote the last term, i.e. the linear evolved counter term, as

$$\mathcal{S}_a(\mathbf{k},\eta) = \int_0^\eta ds\; g_{ab}(\eta-s)\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbf{k},s). \tag{36}$$

From the effective theory point of view, as long as one could accurately fit or estimate the value of $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\eta)$, the entire statistical information, including all orders of polyspectra of $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$ would be recovered precisely, given that the large-scale mode coupling $[\gamma\psi\psi]_{\Lambda\Lambda}$ is much easier to calculate. Mathematically, to calculate the term $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda)$, one has to integrate over the joint probability density function of all relevant variables $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \{\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda,\mathbf{\Psi}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}\}$, since by definition, the conditional average is expressed as

$$\langle\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\rangle\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda) = \int\mathcal{D}\mathbf{\Psi}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}\;(\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2})\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Gamma}), \tag{37}$$

where $\mathcal{D}\mathbf{\Psi}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ is the volume element of the $\mathbf{\Psi}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ space. In general, this would produce a non-linear function of *all* large-scale modes in $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$, which means that a full description of the effective dynamics of mode $\boldsymbol{\psi}_\mathbf{k}$ would require some *non-local* (in Fourier space) effective terms that is related to $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}'}$ where $\mathbf{k}'\neq\mathbf{k}$. Without any explicit calculation, this could be seen from the Taylor expansion that

$$\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda) = \frac{\partial\mathcal{C}_{a,\mathbf{k}}}{\partial\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}}}\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}} + \frac{1}{2!}\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{C}_{a,\mathbf{k}}}{\partial\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\partial\Psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}}\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\Psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2} + \frac{1}{3!}\frac{\partial^3\mathcal{C}_{a,\mathbf{k}}}{\partial\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\partial\Psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}\partial\Psi_{d,\mathbf{k}_3}}\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\Psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}\Psi_{d,\mathbf{k}_3} + \cdots \tag{38}$$

where $\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{k}_n\in\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$, and we have assumed $\langle\Psi_a(\mathbf{k})\rangle = 0$. An effective approach is then related to any efforts that try to obtain these effective coefficients $\partial^n\mathcal{C}/\partial\mathbf{\Psi}_1\cdots\partial\mathbf{\Psi}_n$ as accurate as possible.

Although we have to seek the help of numerical simulation eventually, one still gain valuable insight by some analytic calculations. From the definition equation (37), we first notice that a Gaussian $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Gamma})$ will not produce any non-trivial result. However, by applying the so-called Gram-Charlier expansion of the non-Gaussian PDF $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Gamma})$, we would be able to perturbatively calculate the conditional average. In general, this



FIG. 2. Tree order bispectra that will be used for perturbative calculation of the effective counter-terms $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda)$. Solid lines denote soft modes $q < \Lambda$, and long-dashed lines indicate hard modes, i.e. $q > \Lambda$, while short-dashed lines could be either hard or soft mode. A circle with a cross inside denotes the initial power spectrum.

expansion could be written as [40–43]

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Gamma}) = \mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{\Gamma}) \left[1 + \sum_{n\geq 3} \frac{1}{n!} \langle \mathbf{\Gamma}^n \rangle_{GC} \otimes_T \boldsymbol{H}_n(\mathbf{\Gamma})\right], \quad (39)$$

where $\otimes_T$ denotes the inner produce of two tensors, $\mathcal{P}_G$ is the Gaussian part of $\mathcal{P}$, and the Hermite tensor $\boldsymbol{H}_n$ is defined as $\boldsymbol{H}_n(\mathbf{\Gamma}) = (-1)^n \mathcal{P}_G^{-1}(\mathbf{\Gamma}) \partial^n \mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{\Gamma}) / \partial^n \mathbf{\Gamma}$. The conditional average could then be expressed in terms of Gram-Charlier coefficients $\langle \mathbf{\Gamma}^n \rangle_{GC}$ which then related to the cumulants of various modes, i.e. the polyspectra here.

Since by construction, our effective solution recovers the statistics of the real system, it would be interesting to examine whether this is also true at the perturbative level. Naively, since the formalism applies regardless of the initial condition, one would expect this will be the case. In the rest of the section, we will expand these counter-terms to the one-loop order, i.e. up to the bispectra in equation (39). To proceed, however, one first notices that the condition average would be different for the *hard-hard* ($\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}$) and *soft-hard* ($\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}, \widetilde{\Lambda}\Lambda$) couplings. While equation (37) would apply for hard-hard coupling, the soft-hard modes would be simplified to

$$\langle \psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1} \psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2} | \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda \rangle = \langle \psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1} | \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda \rangle \Psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}. \quad (40)$$

The perturbative formula for calculating the conditional average is presented in Appendix A.

B. Perturbation Theory

Equation (38) expands the $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda, \eta)$ as a function of $\Psi_a(\mathbf{k}, \eta)$ at some later time η. Following the spirit of standard perturbation theory, we would also like to expand $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k}, \eta)$ in terms of initial field ϕ_a so that

$$\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda; \eta) = \sum_n \mathcal{C}_a^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda; \eta). \quad (41)$$

As will be seen in this section, it suffices to calculate one-loop counter-terms with the help of tree-level bispectra, which include three different contributions

$$B^T_{bcd}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{k}) = B^{T(\mathrm{I})}_{bcd} + B^{T(\mathrm{II})}_{bcd} + B^{T(\mathrm{III})}_{bcd}. \quad (42)$$

In the standard formula, they are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} B^{T(\mathrm{I})}_{bcd}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{k}) &= 2\int_0^\eta ds\; g_{c\alpha}(\eta - s) \gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}) \\ &\quad \left[g_{\beta\delta}(s) g_{b\tau}(\eta) P^0_{\delta\tau}(q)\right] \Big[g_{\gamma\lambda}(s) \\ &\quad g_{d\epsilon}(\eta) P^0_{\lambda\epsilon}(k)\Big], \\ B^{T(\mathrm{II})}_{bcd}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{k}) &= B^{T(\mathrm{I})}_{cbd}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{k}), \\ B^{T(\mathrm{III})}_{bcd}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{k}) &= B^{T(\mathrm{I})}_{cdb}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

The diagrams of these three contributions are shown in FIG. (2). In the rest of the paper, we will always assume $\mathbf{k}$ ($\mathbf{q}$) denotes the wavenumber of some soft (hard) mode.

1. Hard-hard Coupling

The hard-hard coupling involves the ensemble average of two random small-scale modes, conditional on large-scale modes, i.e. $\langle \psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1} \psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2} | \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda \rangle$. Denoting $x_{1,2}$ as modes $\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}$ or $\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}$ respectively, and $\boldsymbol{Y} = \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$, the Gaussian part of this average equals

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x_1 x_2 | \boldsymbol{Y} \rangle_G = \xi^{x_1 x_2} + \xi^{x_1 Y}_\alpha \xi^{x_2 Y}_\beta \Big[&\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\gamma} \left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\beta\delta} Y_\delta Y_\delta \\ &- \left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}\Big], \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

where $\xi^{x_1 x_2}$ is the correlation function between x_1 and x_2, and $\xi^{x_1 Y}_\alpha$ the correlation between x_1 and α-th element of $\boldsymbol{Y}$. Similarly, $\xi^Y_{\alpha\beta}$ is the correlation between α-th and β-th elements of $\boldsymbol{Y}$, and $\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the inverse. Since by the definition of $\mathcal{C}_\alpha(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda, \eta)$ (equation 34), $\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 = \mathbf{k} \neq 0$, the first term vanishes because of the statistical translational invariance. Similarly, the second contribution is also zero since $x_{1,2}$ and modes in $\boldsymbol{Y}$ belong to different scales. The next leading order, which we present its full formula in equation (A4), has only one non-vanishing contribution

$$\langle x_1 x_2 | \boldsymbol{Y} \rangle = \xi^{x_1 x_2 Y}_\alpha \left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta} Y_\beta, \quad (45)$$

where $\xi^{x_1 x_2 Y}_\alpha = \langle x_1 x_2 Y_\alpha \rangle_c$ is the bispectra of x_1, x_2 and Y_α.



FIG. 3. Schematics that demonstrate the Feynman rules for constructing the evolved hard-hard effective terms $\mathcal{S}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda,\eta)$ at the one-loop order. Specifically, equation (34) and (46) indicates that one only need to connect the symmetric perturbative kernel $\gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})$ together with conditional average terms, which in one-loop order is the tree-level bispectra $B^{T(\mathrm{I,II,III})}$ and the inverse power spectrum $P^{-1}_{de}(\mathbf{k})$. The dashed-lines denote the hard modes, while solid lines represent soft modes. The numerical factor 1/2 in front of the last diagram is caused by releasing the causal relation $s_2 \leq s_1$ assumed initially. From the diagram representation of these two contributions, we could already see that they would recover the hard-hard part of the one-loop power spectrum exactly simply by taking the average with some linear solution $\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$, .

Therefore, to the first order, the hard-hard-bispectra parts of the effective coefficients $\mathcal{C}^{B}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$ is expressed as an integral of the bispectrum with the kernel γ_{abc},

$$\mathcal{C}^{B}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = \int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})B_{bcd}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k};\eta) \times P^{-1}_{de}(k,\eta)\Psi_e(\mathbf{k},\eta), \quad (46)$$

where the integral is over the region where both q and $|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|$ are greater than Λ, and all the quantities here are evaluated at time η. Here the bispectrum $B(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k})$ should be fully non-linear, as well as the power spectra $P_{de}(k,s)$ and its inverse. This would alleviate the problem of singular IC since even at some early stage, a tiny amount of nonlinearity would be able to render the $P^{-1}(k,s)$ mathematically well-defined.

At the lowest order, we can take the tree-level bispectrum $B^T \propto P^2_{lin}$, where P_{lin} is the linear power spectrum, and this is already sufficient to produce the one-loop order of $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda,\eta)$. Substituting the equation (43) back into equation (46), we then have three separate contributions. Since the kernel $\gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})$ is symmetric with respect to $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}$, the contribution from $B^{T(\mathrm{I})}$ and $B^{T(\mathrm{II})}$ would be identical. Therefore, the effective coefficient reads

$$\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{I+II})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = 4\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})\int_0^s ds\ g_{c\alpha}(\eta-s) \times \gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k})\Big[g_{\beta\delta}(s)g_{b\tau}(\eta)P^0_{\delta\tau}(q)\Big] \times \Psi_\gamma(\mathbf{k},s_2). \quad (47)$$

Here we have already applied the identity that

$$\begin{aligned}\delta^K_{\gamma\tau} &= g_{\alpha\beta}(s)P^0_{\beta\gamma}(k)P^{-1}_{\alpha\delta}(k,s)g_{\delta\tau}(s)\\ &= g_{\alpha\beta}(s)P^0_{\beta\mu}(k)g_{\mu\nu}(s)g^{-1}_{\nu\gamma}(s)P^{-1}_{\alpha\delta}(k,s)g_{\delta\tau}(s),\end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

assuming $P_{\alpha\delta}(k,s)$ is not singular, and we have only kept the linear part of its inversion $P^{-1}_{lin}(k)$. One could further write down the time-evolved coefficient $\mathcal{S}^{B^T}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$, whose Feynman diagram is presented in FIG. (3). Particularly, in the same figure, we demonstrate the general rule for constructing these 'counter-terms', which is simply paring the symmetric PT kernel $\gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})$ together with various contribution from the conditional average terms, i.e. $B^{T(\mathrm{I,II})}$ and $P^{-1}_{lin}\Psi$ here.

From the diagram, it is obvious that one would recover the one-loop power spectrum $P^{13}(k)$ with the contribution from $\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I+II})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$

$$\begin{aligned}P^{(13)}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},ab}(\mathbf{k},\eta) &= 2\left\langle \mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I+II})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)\Psi^{(1)}_b(-\mathbf{k},\eta)\right\rangle\\ &= 6P^0(k)\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \mathcal{F}^{(3)}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q};\eta)P^0(q).\end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Again, here we are only integrating over the Fourier region $q > \Lambda$ and $|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}| > \Lambda$, which corresponds to the region $q > \Lambda$ and $\mu < (k^2+q^2-\Lambda^2)/(2kq)$, where μ is the cosine of the angle between $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{q}$. This does seem a bit odd in SPT formula since there is only one integral in equation (49), and $\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}$ does not even appear in the definition of $\mathcal{F}^{(3)}$, but the meaning is clear from the time-evolved representation like equation (47).

Equation (49) helps us to derive a much simpler expression for $\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I+II})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$ with the kernel of the standard perturbation theory

$$\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I+II})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = 3\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \mathcal{F}^{(3)}_{ac}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q};\eta) \times P^0(q)\phi_c(\mathbf{k}), \tag{50}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^{(3)}_{ac}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q}) = \mathcal{F}^{(3)}_{acde}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q})u_d u_e$. This further suggests that the effective coefficient should be

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{I+II})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},s) &= 6\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \mathcal{F}^{(3)}_{ab}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q};s)P^0(q)\phi_b(\mathbf{k}) \\ &= 6\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \mathcal{F}^{(3)}_{a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q};s)P^0(q)\delta_0(\mathbf{k}).\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Furthermore, we then substitute the last $B^{T(\mathrm{III})}$ into the equation (46), the coefficient reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = 2\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})\int_0^\eta ds\ g_{d\alpha}(\eta-s) \\ \times\ \gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k},-\mathbf{q})\Big[g_{\beta\delta}(s)g_{c\tau}(\eta) \\ \times P^0_{\delta\tau}(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|)\Big]\Big[g_{\gamma\lambda}(s)g_{b\epsilon}(\eta)P^0_{\lambda\epsilon}(q)\Big] \\ \times\ P^{-1}_{de}(k,s)\Psi_e(\mathbf{k},s)\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

Unlike equation (47), we are not able to simplify the expression by canceling the power spectrum with its inverse, i.e. equation (48), as $P^{-1}(k)$ does not immediately connect to any other $P(k)$. Rather, the cancelation would only be achieved by taking the average with another linear field $\mathbf{\Psi}^{(1)}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$. We would show that this contribution would be identical to the hard-hard part of the P_{22} term

$$\begin{aligned}P^{(22)}_{\widetilde{\Lambda\Lambda},ab}(k,\eta) &= 2\Big\langle \mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)\Psi^{(1)}_b(-\mathbf{k},\eta)\Big\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\times 4\int_0^\eta ds_1\ g_{am}(\eta-s_1)\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q} \\ &\quad\times\gamma_{mnc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})\int_0^\eta ds_2\ g_{d\alpha}(s_1-s_2) \\ &\quad\times\gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k},-\mathbf{q})\Big[g_{\gamma\lambda}(s)g_{n\epsilon}(\eta)P^0_{\lambda\epsilon}(q)\Big] \\ &\quad\times\Big[g_{\beta\delta}(s)g_{c\tau}(\eta)P^0_{\delta\tau}(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|)\Big]g_{bd}(\eta-s_1) \\ &= 2\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \mathcal{F}^{(2)}_{a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q};\eta)\mathcal{F}^{(2)}_{b}(-\mathbf{k},-\mathbf{q};\eta) \\ &\quad\times\ P^0(q)P^0(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|).\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

The numerical factor 1/2 raises from the fact that the time integral in equation (52) is limited by causal constraint $s_2 \le s_1$, which could also be seen from the diagram representation in FIG. (3). Since there is no difference in deriving this term compared to the one contributing to P^{13}, in this sense, unlike other effective approaches, we interpret this counter term as deterministic instead of stochastic in our formalism. We will explain in more detail in section V A.

2. Soft-hard Coupling

From equation (40) and (A3), the only non-vanishing contribution of soft-hard coupling that is proportional to the bispectrum is a quadratic term

$$\langle x_1|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\xi^{x_1 YY}_{\alpha\beta}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\lambda}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\beta\tau}Y_\lambda Y_\tau. \tag{54}$$

Denoting x_1 as one component of $\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{q})$ and x_2 for $\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})$ where $q>\Lambda$ and $|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|<\Lambda$, the only relevant bispectrum will be $B(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k})$. Therefore, the effective coefficient in this case could then be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{B^T}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = 4\times\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})B^T_{bcd}(\mathbf{q}, \\ \mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k};\eta)P^{-1}_{ce}(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|;\eta)P^{-1}_{df}(k;\eta) \\ \times\Psi_e(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k};\eta)\Psi_f(\mathbf{k};\eta)\Psi_g(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q};\eta).\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Besides the numerical factor 1/2 from equation (54), a factor of 2 raises from the two symmetric Fourier region $\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}$ and $\widetilde{\Lambda}\Lambda$; and the other factor of 2 comes from the fact that equation (54) have two cross contributions when summing over Y_λ and Y_τ.

Similarly, we could substitute the tree-level bispectrum (equation 43), and obtain the one-loop order $\mathcal{C}^{B^T}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$. For $B^{T(\mathrm{I})}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{I})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = 4\int_{\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})\int_0^\eta ds\ g_{d\alpha}(\eta-s) \\ \times\ \gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k})\Big[g_{\beta\delta}(s)g_{b\tau}(\eta)P^0_{\delta\tau}(q)\Big] \\ \times P^{-1}_{df}(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|;\eta)\Psi_c(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},\eta)\Psi_f(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k},\eta) \\ \times\Psi_\gamma(\mathbf{k},s).\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

This equation corresponds to the left-bottom diagram in FIG. (4). Clearly, it is *non-local* in Fourier space, as the coefficient for Fourier mode $\mathbf{k}$ also depends on the mode $\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}$, where $q>\Lambda$. To better understand this term, we have to study the corresponding contribution to the power spectrum, i.e. $\left\langle \mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})\Psi^{(1)}_b(-\mathbf{k})\right\rangle$. From the diagram, the only possible way is to connect $\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}$ mode with $\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}$ mode, which we highlight in the figure. And it is clearly that this would produce the soft-hard part of $P_{13}(\mathbf{k})$, where the integration is over the hard-mode $P(q)$.

For the bispectrum $B^{T(\mathrm{II})}$, one similarly write down the effective term as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{II})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = 4\int_{\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})\int_0^\eta ds\ g_{b\alpha}(\eta-s) \\ \times\ \gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k})\Psi_c(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q};\eta)\Psi_\beta(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k};s) \\ \times\ \Psi_\gamma(\mathbf{k};s),\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$



FIG. 4. The soft-hard part of the effective terms up to one-loop order. Unlike the hard-hard coupling, these contributions are all *non-local* in Fourier space, which means the effective terms for the evolution of Fourier mode $\mathbf{k}$ not only depends on mode $\mathbf{k}$ but also $\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}$. For these non-local diagrams, one could see that the first two diagrams at the bottom would form the soft-hard version of $P_{13}(\mathbf{k})$, and the third one would form $P_{22}(\mathbf{k})$ contribution. The ellipses highlight the pairs that would eventually be connected together when taking the ensemble average with another linear field $\mathbf{\Psi}(\mathbf{k})$.

which is presented as the middle-bottom diagram of FIG. (4). When taking the ensemble average, $\Psi(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})$ will connect with $\Psi(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k})$, therefore this would also contribute to the $P_{13}(k)$, where the integration is over the soft mode $P(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|)$. Finally, the last term could be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{2\Lambda\tilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = 4\int_{\Lambda\tilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q})\int_0^\eta ds\ g_{b\alpha}(\eta-s)\\ \times\ \gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k},-\mathbf{q})\Big[g_{\gamma\lambda}(s)g_{b\epsilon}(\eta)P^0_{\lambda\epsilon}(q)\Big]\\ \times\ P^{-1}_{eg}(k;\eta)\Psi_\beta(\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k};s)\Psi_c(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q};\eta)\\ \times\ \Psi_g(\mathbf{k};\eta).\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

From the figure, one could see this contribution will contribute to $P_{22,\Lambda\tilde{\Lambda}}(k)$. In Table I, we listed all effective coefficients and their corresponding contribution in the standard perturbation theory. Evidently, this demonstrates that the effective solution is simply a reorganization of the standard perturbative calculation at one-loop level. It also indicates that the Fourier nonlocality of these effective terms is *crucial* to the full recovery of the statistical information.

3. The Singular Initial Condition

So far, we have assumed that the power spectrum of large-scale modes $P_{ab}(\mathbf{k},\eta)$ is always invertible. At linear order, this essentially requires that both the initial power spectrum $P^0_{ab}(k)$ and linear propagator $g_{ab}(\eta)$ are non-singular. While the latter could be achieved without discarding the decaying mode, the initial power spectrum $P^0_{ab}(k)$, however, would not be invertible unless *assuming* a non-zero cross-correlation as suggested in equation (29). This initial condition has led us to a formalism that is very familiar in the context standard perturbation theory, and it is reasonable to expect that our formula is still mathematically well-defined most of time [3], since $P^{-1}_{ab}(k,\eta)$ appeared in the equations is always non-linearly evolved to η, even though the non-linearity could be tiny. However, for perturbative discussion, there are some effective terms that explicitly depend on the $P^{-1}_{lin,ab}(k,\eta)$, e.g. $\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_a(\mathbf{k},\eta)$, we will discuss various possible choices in this subsection.

One straightforward solution is to simply consider only one dynamical variable, either $\delta(\mathbf{k})$ or $\theta(\mathbf{k})$. Since the nonlinear mode coupling of $\theta(\mathbf{k})$ does not involve δ field, and its modification resemble the non-ideal fluid dynamics, one might prefer to study the statistically equivalent solution of the set of large scale velocity divergence $\mathbf{\Theta}_\Lambda = \{\Theta(\mathbf{k}), k<\Lambda\}$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\eta\theta(\mathbf{k}) + (g-1)\theta(\mathbf{k}) - g\langle\delta(\mathbf{k})|\mathbf{\Theta}_\Lambda\rangle\\ = \beta(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\langle\theta(\mathbf{k}_1)\theta(\mathbf{k}_2)|\mathbf{\Theta}_\Lambda\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Hence, besides the effective mode coupling term, one also needs to evaluate the conditional average $\langle\delta(\mathbf{k})|\mathbf{\Theta}_\Lambda\rangle$. At the linear order, $\langle\delta(\mathbf{k})|\mathbf{\Theta}_\Lambda\rangle = \Theta(\mathbf{k})$. At the one-loop order, equation (54) guarantees the result is well-defined since $(\xi^Y)^{-1}$ would be simply $1/P_{\theta\theta}(k)$. By expressing these terms as some non-linear function of $\mathbf{\Theta}_\Lambda$, this is essentially equivalent to the approach adopted by the

[3] probably except for a brief moment right after the initial epoch.

$P^{SPT}_{1-loop}(k)$	Effective Terms (ET)
$P_{13,\Lambda\Lambda}(k), P_{22,\Lambda\Lambda}(k)$	*no ET*
$P_{13,\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}}(k)$	$\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{I})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})$, $\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{II})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})$
$P_{22,\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}}(k)$	$\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})$
$P_{13,\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}}(k)$ hard-integral	$\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{I})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k})$
$P_{13,\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}}(k)$ soft-integral	$\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{II})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k})$
$P_{22,\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}}(k)$	$\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k})$

TABLE I. Table of effective counter-terms and their corresponding contributions to the one-loop standard perturbation calculation. For non-local terms, we have explicitly denoted their dependence on the extra Fourier modes. Clearly, the effective approach is simply a re-organization of SPT at this level, and it is critical to include all these non-local terms for the complete recovery of SPT.

sliced-time perturbation theory [37, 38], although the cut-off scale Λ was set to ∞ there. Since we are more interested in the density perturbation in practice, this then leads us to another layer of nonlinearity to recover $\delta(\mathbf{k})$ and complicates the problem [37]. Instead, one might just consider the effective continuity equation, i.e.

$$\partial_\eta\delta(\mathbf{k}) - \langle\theta(\mathbf{k})|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\Lambda\rangle = \alpha(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\langle\theta(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta(\mathbf{k}_2)|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\Lambda\rangle, \tag{60}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\Lambda = \{\Delta(\mathbf{k}), k<\Lambda\}$. Similarly, one could then try to express conditional average as a nonlinear function of large-scale density perturbation without worrying about the $P^{-1}_{ab}(\mathbf{k})$.

Both equations (59) and (60) suggest to only consider the well-defined part of the PDF. Since our non-singular initial condition only requires a non-trivial cross correlation (i.e. equation 29), it further suggests that we might still be able to keep our two-component formalism and derive a reasonable expression by concentrating on the PDF of δ and θ separately. Consequently, our goal is then to look for the practically feasible effective terms $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda,\eta)$ that ensure the conservation of $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\Delta}_\Lambda)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{\Theta}_\Lambda)$ together. Particularly, for the term $\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}$, i.e. the one related to the $P_{22,ab}(\mathbf{k})$, it would be safe to express it as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = \frac{1}{P_a(k;\eta)}\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \mathcal{F}^{(2)}_a(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q};\eta)\\ \times\mathcal{F}^{(2)}_b(-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q};\eta)P^0(q)\\ \times P^0(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|)\phi_b(\mathbf{k}),\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where b is the index for forming the power spectrum $P_{ab}(k)$. Unlike equation (50), the appearance of the separate index b indicates it to be unphysical, since this term somehow 'know' which field we are going to correlate with in advance. In practice, however, if we neglect the cross power spectrum $P_{\delta\theta}$, and assume only the fastest growing mode, this ambiguity could be eliminated. This corresponds to express the effective term as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = \frac{2\ e^{3\eta}\phi_a(\mathbf{k})}{P^0_a(k)}\int_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}} d\mathbf{q}\ \mathcal{F}^{(2)}_a(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q})\\ \times\ \mathcal{F}^{(2)}_a(-\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{q})P^0(q)P^0(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|)\\ \text{(no summation)},\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where we have temporarily suspended the Einstein summation rule. Therefore, as long as we are only interested in the auto-correlation of δ and θ, it is guaranteed that we will always have mathematically well-defined effective terms.

C. The Effective Theory

While it is very interesting and enlightening to study the mapping between our formalism and standard calculation at the perturbation level, it is much more appealing to further explore this formula as an effective theory of the large-scale structure, since in principle it provides all necessary UV information to recover the statistics. Specifically, if we were able to calibrate the effective coefficients $\mathcal{C}_a(\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta)$ (or $\mathcal{S}_a(\mathbf{k},\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta)$) from either numerical simulation or observations, we then obtain an effective theory of the large-scale structure which would reproduce the exact statistical evolution by construction in the context of no shell-crossing [4].

1. *Effective Coefficients*

As an effective theory, we already noticed that this formalism is intrinsically non-local in Fourier space. In the discrete limit where the number of large-scale modes are finite, one eventually has a set of coupled differential equations

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\mathbf{k}_0} &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}[\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda]_{\mathbf{k}_0} + \sum_{m\geq1}\boldsymbol{\partial}^m\mathcal{C}[\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda\cdots\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda]_{\mathbf{k}_0}\\ \cdots\qquad &\qquad\cdots\cdots\\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{\mathbf{k}_n} &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}[\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda]_{\mathbf{k}_n} + \sum_{m\geq1}\boldsymbol{\partial}^m\mathcal{C}[\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda\cdots\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda]_{\mathbf{k}_n},\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

for Fourier modes $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_\Lambda = \{\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{k_0},\cdots,\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{k_n}\}$, and we have adopted the short-handed notation where the element of $\boldsymbol{\partial}^m\mathcal{C}$ denotes

$$\partial^m\mathcal{C}_{ab_1\cdots b_m} = \frac{1}{m!}\frac{\partial^m\mathcal{C}_a}{\partial\Psi_{b_1,k_1}\cdots\partial\Psi_{b_m,k_m}} \tag{64}$$

and $[\cdots]_{k_n}$ denotes all possible couplings where the sum of all k modes equals k_n. Unlike the EFT of LSS, since

[4] Of course, this statement would be exact once we include the contribution from shell-crossing in section V.



FIG. 5. Diagrams for effective coefficients $\mathcal{S}_a(\mathbf{k},\Lambda)$, which could be expressed as integral over higher-order correlators, e.g. bispectrum, trispectrum etc., with the kernel γ_{abc}. Similar to previous figures, the solid line represents the linear growth of large-scale mode $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$, while the dashed line corresponds to small-scale modes $\mathbf{\Psi}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$. The grey ellipse symbolize complicated nonlinear interactions among various modes. Ideally, these interactions could be measured and carefully calibrated with simulation, which then leads to an effective theory of large-scale structure. In the upper row, we illustrate the hard-hard coupling and show the hard-soft interaction at the second row.

we started from the equal time PDF, these terms are temporally local by definition, i.e. all $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}$'s appeared in the equation of motion (63) are only functions of η at given epoch.

In FIG. (5), we illustrate the first several nonperturbative diagrams representing the time-evolved effective terms $\mathcal{S}_a(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta)$. Notice that two diagrams in the first column are a nonlinear generalization of the one-loop effective terms we have discussed. For example, the first hard-hard diagram consists of equation (46) with *nonlinear* bispectrum $B_{nl}(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k})$, but it also includes similar integrals with five or more points polyspectra. For hard-hard coupling, the linear effective term (with regard to the number of soft modes) in general depends on $\mathbf{k}$,

$$\mathcal{C}^{(1)}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k}) = \partial^1\mathcal{C}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda},ab}(\mathbf{k})\Psi_b(\mathbf{k}) = c_s^2(\mathbf{k})k^2\Psi_a(\mathbf{k}), \quad (65)$$

where $\partial^1\mathcal{C}$ is defined in equation (64), and we have also defined a scale dependent sound speed $c_s^2(\mathbf{k})$ in the last equality. This corresponds to the first diagram in Fig. (5), all other diagrams depend explicitly on large-scale modes other than $\mathbf{k}$. Specifically, the number of external large-scale lags starts from three for the soft-hard couplings (*second row*), this then raises the questions about the number of effective terms needed even at the lowest order.

At the one-loop order, however, it is sufficient to consider only the linear effective term, i.e. equation (65), even including the soft-hard coupling. This is because the power spectra constructed from these terms (*second row* in FIG. 4) will be paired with a linear mode $\Psi_b(-\mathbf{k})$, i.e. $\left\langle \mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I,II,III})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})\Psi_b(-\mathbf{k})\right\rangle$, and with the assumption of Gaussian initial condition, the only way is to pair modes $\phi_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}}$ with $\phi_{\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}}$, as highlighted by ellipses in FIG. (4). These effective terms $\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I,II,III})}_{2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})$ would then contribute to various soft-hard integral of P_{13} and P_{22}. Consequently, their effects could all be represented by some k-dependent factor multiplied by linear mode, as highlighted by square region in the upper panel of FIG. (6).

Particularly, for coefficient $\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{I,II})}_{UV,a}(\mathbf{k})$, where $UV = \{\widetilde{\Lambda}\widetilde{\Lambda}, 2\Lambda\widetilde{\Lambda}\}$ denotes both hard-hard and soft-hard couplings, its ensemble average with $\Psi_b(-\mathbf{k})$ give the full UV integral of the $P_{\delta,13}(\mathbf{k})$, so the effective sound speed from this contribution could be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} k^2c^2_{\delta,13,UV}(\mathbf{k}) = k^2\int_{UV}\frac{2\pi q^2P_{lin}(q)\ dqd\mu}{21\left(k^2+q^2\right)^2-4k^2q^2\mu^2} \\ \times\Big[-21k^4\mu^2+2k^2q^2\left(38\mu^4-22\mu^2+5\right) \\ +q^4\left(28\mu^4-59\mu^2+10\right)\Big]. \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

Explicit calculation demonstrates that $c^2_{\delta,13}$ only mildly depends on k, so at the lowest order, it scales with k^2, consistent with the EFT argument.

On the other hand, we have already shown that the effective term $\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{UV,a}(\mathbf{k})$ contributes to the power spectra related to $P_{22}(\mathbf{k})$, which is usually considered as stochastic in literatures of EFT. In our framework, however, it could be represented by term $\left\langle \mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{UV,a}(\mathbf{k})\Psi_b(-\mathbf{k})\right\rangle$. As already discussed, unlike $c^2_{13,UV}(\mathbf{k})$ term, $\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{UV,a}(\mathbf{k})$ is proportional to inverse linear power spectra to recover the $P_{22}(\mathbf{k})$ power spectrum. Consequently, the relevant



FIG. 6. Examples of 1PR (*upper*) and 1PI (*lower*) power spectra diagrams constructed from the hard-soft counter-terms $\mathcal{C}^{B^T}_{2\Lambda\tilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})$. At one-loop order, it could be described by single parameters, i.e. c^2 term shown light box in the first diagram. For higher-orders, this is not true any more. These non-local contributions would play an important role in constructing various SPT diagrams.

effective coefficient could be expressed as

$$k^4 c^2_{\delta,22,UV} = k^4 \int_{UV} 2\pi dq d\mu \, \frac{(7k\mu + 3q - 10q\mu^2)^2}{98(k^2+q^2-2kq\mu)^2} \times \frac{P_{lin}(q)P_{lin}(|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}|)}{P_{lin}(k)}, \quad (67)$$

which scales with k^4, so following equation (65), we have some scale dependent expansion of the linear effective term

$$\mathcal{C}^{(1)}_{UV,a}(\mathbf{k}) = \left(c^2_{1,a}k^2 + c^2_{2,a}k^4 + \cdots\right)\mathbf{\Psi}_a(\mathbf{k}). \quad (68)$$

For higher-loop orders, however, this linear expansion will not be enough, and one has to go back to the original non-local definition of $\mathcal{S}^{B^T}_{2\Lambda\tilde{\Lambda},a}(\mathbf{k})$. In the lower panel of FIG. (6), we illustrate an example of such diagram. Unlike the one-loop order (e.g. the one in the upper panel), this so-called one particle irreducible (1PI) contribution will not be represented by a linear effective term as equation (65). Therefore, in order to have sufficient freedom to fully describe all UV scale effects, it is necessary to include all non-local terms. Finally, we also notice that at higher-order, these effective contributions are *not* a simple re-organization of the SPT diagrams. For example, $\left\langle \mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{UV,a}(\mathbf{k})\mathcal{S}^{B^T(\mathrm{III})}_{UV,b}(-\mathbf{k})\right\rangle$ includes an $P^{-1}_{ab}(\mathbf{k})$ that will not be cancelled by any initial $P_{ab}(\mathbf{k})$. We will defer the study of these higher loop contributions in the future.

2. Λ-dependence

In the framework of effective field theory, it is critical to introduce the concept of regularization and renormalization. In our formalism, both large-scale coupling as well as effective contributions explicitly depend on the cutoff scale Λ. However, assuming we are interested in a subset of large-scale modes, say $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Gamma \in \mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$, which does not really depend on Λ as long as Γ is small. Likewise, the evolution of the joint PDF of $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Gamma$ should not depend on Λ, because marginalizing over $\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$ would be the same as marginalizing over $\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ first then over $\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Gamma}}/\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$, which is the complement set of $\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ with respect to $\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Gamma}}$. So,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}\left(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Gamma\right) &= \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Gamma}}\, \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_{all}) \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}} \int \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}/\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Gamma}}\right)\, \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_{all}). \quad (69)\end{aligned}$$

This guarantees that our statistical effective dynamics of $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Gamma$ would not depend on the cutoff scale Λ either. Therefore, similar to the effective field theory, all our effective coefficients are composed of Λ-dependent and Λ-independent parts. The former appears simply to cancel out the Λ-dependence of the theory, leaving only the Λ-independent part.

3. Cumulants vs. Gradients Expansion

A clear distinction between the formula we have derived so far and the usual effective theory is the parameters on which the series has been expanded. The EFT works in the real space, and attempts to expand as the number of local gradient operators ∇ (or the power of k in Fourier space), the Edgeworth series we used to estimate the conditional average (equation 34) is an expansion of the degree of the non-Gaussianity, i.e. the cumulants of the field. While there certainly exists a mapping between these two approaches like what we did in equation (68), especially for those hard-hard coupling terms, we might benefit from performing both approaches.

Undoubtedly, ∇ (or k) expansion is beneficial in practice as it has a better control over the convergence of the perturbation calculation at certain k scale. But it might also conceal any existing internal structures among those counter-terms, making itself vulnerable to the critique of overfitting. In this regard, the cumulants expansion would serve as a self-calibration process, since these terms are simply some integral of high order statistics.

In principle, for a given scale Λ, one would be able to measure these coefficients directly from the simulation, since by definition they are simply some integral of polyspectra. For example, with the measurement of nonlinear bispectra (equation 46), we would be able to obtain a better knowledge on the first diagram in FIG. (5).

V. THE ORBIT CROSSING

The most appealing potential of the effective approach is the ability to deal with the dynamics after the orbit crossing, where the standard fluid description failed to describe. In section III, we have already written down the formal non-closed equations of motion. Naively, following the same procedure in last section, and assuming we are only interested in the large-scale density and velocity perturbation, i.e. $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$, the effective trajectory should simply be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ab}\Psi_{b,\mathbf{k}} = \gamma_{abc}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\left\langle\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\right\rangle + \gamma^{\omega}_{aib}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\\ \times\left\langle\omega_{i,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_2}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\right\rangle + \gamma^{\omega^2}_{aij}(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)\\ \times\left\langle\omega_{i,\mathbf{k}_1}\omega_{j,\mathbf{k}_2}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\right\rangle + \left\langle\pi_{a,\mathbf{k}}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\right\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

Therefore, the extra information from shell-crossing would be fully characterized by various conditional average terms of vorticity and velocity dispersion. However, this is based on the assumption that our PDF evolution equation is still deterministic and described by equation (6). At this point, it is not clear to what extent such statement would be correct. Therefore, in this section, we would first like to clarify the concept of stochasticity adopted here, and then try to extend our formalism in order to incorporate such potentially existing contribution.

A. Deterministic vs. Stochastic Process

In this subsection, we would like to re-examine the kinetic equation derived in section II. Before proceeding, one first notices that there isn't any assumption regarding the property of the dynamical system being made until equation (4). Now consider that after the shell-crossing, we could modify the original fluid dynamics as some stochastic process, which besides the usual deterministic source term, is driven by an additional stochastic force $\Delta\boldsymbol{F}$. To some extent, this is a legitimate assumption as we are trying to capture any statistical influence of microscopic degree of freedoms we have neglected. To be more mathematically rigorous, we consider the PDF evolution after a short time interval $\Delta\eta$ since a general stochastic process is not necessarily differentiable, so the PDF increment is

$$\Delta\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta+\Delta\eta) - \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta). \tag{71}$$

Besides the deterministic source term $\boldsymbol{\chi}$, we assume that there is an extra stochastic force $\boldsymbol{F}$, so that after $\Delta\eta$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi} &= \boldsymbol{\psi}(\eta+\Delta\eta) - \boldsymbol{\psi}(\eta)\\ &= \boldsymbol{\chi}(\eta)\Delta\eta + \Delta\boldsymbol{F} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta\eta^2).\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

From the definition of the PDF (equation 3), one could Taylor-expand the PDF in terms of $\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\mathcal{P} = -\sum_i \partial_{\mathbf{\Psi}^{(i)}}\left\langle\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_f\right\rangle + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}\partial^2_{\mathbf{\Psi}^{(i)}\mathbf{\Psi}^{(j)}}\\ \left\langle\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(i)}\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_f\right\rangle + \mathcal{O}\left(\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}^3\right).\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Notice that unlike equation (4), we have kept the seconds order term in $\Delta\boldsymbol{\psi}$. Inserting equation (72) and taking the limit $\Delta\eta\to 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\eta\mathcal{P} = \lim_{\Delta\eta\to0}\frac{\Delta\mathcal{P}}{\Delta\eta} = -\sum_i\partial_{\mathbf{\Psi}^{(i)}}\left\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}\mathcal{P}_f\right\rangle\\ +\frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}\partial^2_{\mathbf{\Psi}^{(i)}\mathbf{\Psi}^{(j)}}\left[\left\langle\Delta\boldsymbol{F}^{(i)}\Delta\boldsymbol{F}^{(j)}\right\rangle\mathcal{P}\right] + \cdots\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where we have further assumed that the force increment is statistically independent with zero mean $\langle\Delta\boldsymbol{F}\rangle = 0$ so that the term $\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}\Delta\boldsymbol{F}\mathcal{P}_f\rangle$ vanishes. For Markovian process, the variance of $\Delta\boldsymbol{F}$ is linear in $\Delta\eta$

$$\left\langle\Delta F^{(i)}(\eta)\Delta F^{(j)}(\eta)\right\rangle = \mathcal{C}^{(ij)}(\eta)\Delta\eta. \tag{75}$$

This then leads to the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\eta\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda) = -\sum_i\partial_{\mathbf{\Psi}^{(i)}}\left[\left\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}\middle|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\right\rangle\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda)\right]\\ +\frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}\partial^2_{\mathbf{\Psi}^{(i)}\mathbf{\Psi}^{(j)}}\left[\mathcal{C}^{(ij)}\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

For general stochastic process, the PDF evolution could then be further expanded with the so-called Kramers-Moyal expansion. Therefore, from kinetic point of view, there is no intrinsic differences between stochastic and deterministic contributions as both of them gradually change the PDF, except that the time evolution equation of PDF differs. Thus, in this paper, we will regard any contribution that could *modify the underlying equation* of the PDF evolution from its linear form (equation 6) as *stochastic*. On the other hand, the solutions to these equations do differ, since we will not be able to use the method of characteristic. Rather, the effective dyamics of equation (76) will become the Langevin equation

$$\partial_\eta\mathbf{\Psi}^{(i)} = \left\langle\boldsymbol{\chi}^{(i)}\middle|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\right\rangle + \boldsymbol{F}^{(i)}. \tag{77}$$

With this definition, the variation around the mean stress tensor would *not* be regarded as stochastic, which is different from the standard view of the effective field theory. Actually, as already been seen, at least formally, we were able to recovers the $P_{22}(\mathbf{k})$ contribution, which is usually regarded as stochastic. For orbit-crossing terms, like vorticity ω_i and velocity dispersion π_a, most of their effects should also be able to extracted by deterministic contributions via the conditional average (equation 70). In practice, the necessity of including any stochastic contribution could be justified from the comparison to the simulation.

B. Effective Theory Beyond the Orbit Crossing

In the standard theory of the structure formation, a thin sheet of collisionless cold dark matter in the phase space would eventually meet each other and starts to experience the so-called orbit-crossing (or shell-crossing). After the orbit crossing, the initially potential field would generate rotational degree of freedom, which could be seem by simply summing over different streams, i.e. [44, 45]

$$\omega_i = \frac{1}{\rho}\sum_s \left[\left(\nabla_x\rho_s - \frac{\nabla_x\rho}{\rho}\right)\times\ \mathbf{u}_s\right], \tag{78}$$

assuming the vorticity of each stream vanishes, where the subscript s denotes the corresponding quantity of each individual stream. On the other hand, one would also generate the velocity dispersion π_a via equation (14). As shown in equation (16), once ω_i and π_a are generated, even without introducing any stochastic contribution, one would expect their feed back on the density and divergence field.

Consequently, from the perspective of the effective theory, one only need to supplement the appropriate information of ω_i and π_a, namely their correlations with respect to the large scale modes $\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda$. In fact, it is not a new idea to include some contributions to describe the effect of shell-crossing on the matter power spectrum. For example, [46] demonstrated that at the leading order, the dominant effect comes from π_θ. Assuming the density contrast

$$\psi_a(\mathbf{k},\eta) = \psi_{dust,a}(\mathbf{k},\eta) + \int_0^\eta g_{ab}(\eta-\eta')\pi_a(\mathbf{k},\eta'), \tag{79}$$

they showed that the correction to the power spectra at the leading order would be [46]

$$P_{aa}(\mathbf{k},\eta) = P_{dust,aa}(\mathbf{k},\eta) + \frac{P_{a\pi_\theta}(\mathbf{k},\eta)}{(n/2-1)(n/2+3/2)}, \tag{80}$$

where n is defined as the growth index of π_θ, i.e. $\pi_\theta \approx D^{n/2}$. From the direct measurement of the simulation, this would cause 1% correction to $P_{\theta\theta}(P_{\delta\delta})$ around $k \approx 0.1h$/Mpc ($0.2h$/Mpc). It is not difficult to notice the consistency with our effective approach at the this order, since with Gaussian assumption, the related effective term reads (equation A2)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_{\pi_\theta}(\mathbf{k};\eta) &= \langle\pi_{\theta,\mathbf{k}}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda;\eta\rangle \\ &= P_{\pi_\theta a}(\mathbf{k},\eta)P^{-1}_{ab}(\mathbf{k},\eta)\mathbf{\Psi}_b(\mathbf{k},\eta).\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

Clearly, one would recover equation (80) after correlating the time-evolved term $\mathcal{S}_{\pi_\theta}(\mathbf{k})$ with $\mathbf{\Psi}_d(\mathbf{k})$. It would be very interesting to check the non-Gaussian correlation between $\pi_a(\mathbf{k})$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi}_a$, which we will defer to investigate in the future. On the other hand, the correction from the vorticity is much more complicated as it involves more interaction kernels. However, as shown in [46], the effect is much smaller, as the fraction error is roughly 0.002 around $k \approx 0.1h$/Mpc.

In conclusion, from our perspective, as long as we assume the orbit-crossing does not introduce any non-negligible stochastic noise, one could fully account their effects by studying the the cross correlation between large-scale density (velocity) modes with vorticity and π_a.

VI. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we formulated an effective theory of the large-scale density and velocity fluctuation, where the small scale influence is captured by the averaged non-linear coupling conditional on large-scale modes.

- We showed that such effective dynamics is the characteristic solution to the kinetic equation of the PDF evolution. Therefore by construction, it would reproduce the probability distribution $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda,\eta)$, given correct effective terms.

- Naturally, these conditional averages could be expanded in the number of external large-scale modes, and we have showed that non-local terms are necessary for the complete recovery the statistics. To estimate these effective terms, we applied the Gram-Charlier expansion, and demonstrated the agreement with SPT at one-loop order.

- As an effective theory, our formalism looks quite similar to the EFT of LSS at the linear order (in external fields), i.e. equation (65) and (68), except that higher order k dependence would also be captured by terms like equation (46). The distinction is due to different expansion series, i.e. cumulants expansion in our formula versus the gradient expansion of EFT.

- The effective dynamics could be generalized to include the effects from orbit crossing. Particularly, we define a stochastic effective terms as the one would change the underlying PDF evolution equation.

Besides the orbital-crossing terms, eventually, one might be able to perform a direct integral over some highly nonlinear model of the full joint PDF,

$$\langle\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2}|\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda\rangle_{\rm nl}\mathcal{P}_{\rm nl}(\mathbf{\Psi}_\Lambda) = \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{\Psi}_{\tilde{\Lambda}}\ (\psi_{b,\mathbf{k}_1}\psi_{c,\mathbf{k}_2})\mathcal{P}_{\rm nl}(\mathbf{\Gamma}), \tag{82}$$

so that our formalism could then extend to highly non-linear regime.

Generally, this framework could also be applied to many other dynamical systems. For example, one interesting application would be the statistical evolution of biased tracers. Consider a smoothed field of both the number density fluctuation δ_t and the peculiar velocity $\mathbf{u}_t$ of a particular type of tracer, denoted as $\boldsymbol{\psi}_t$, we would like to understand the statistics of the large-scale modes of this field, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{t,\Lambda}$. Following the same

procedure, one could write down the kinetic equation of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Psi}_{t,\Lambda},\eta)$, and study its effective solution. However, unlike the dark matter field, we are less certain about the fluid description of the biased tracer. For example, the number density δ_t does not necessarily conserve. Rather, due to merger, fragmentation and galaxy formation etc., one should expect an extra source term j_t for the continuity equation (13). So the effective dynamics would have a contribution like $\langle j_t|\mathbf{\Psi}_{t,\Lambda}\rangle$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank for productive discussions with Diego Blas, Francis Bernardeau, J. Richard Bond, Tobias Baldauf, Sandrine Codis, Vincent Desjacques, Simon Foreman, Joel Meyers, Enrico Pajer, Ue-Li Pen, Roman Scoccimarro and Sergey Sibiryakov.

Appendix A: Conditional Expectation of Mode Coupling

We have to estimate the conditional expectation of the form $\langle x_1|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle$ and $\langle x_1x_2|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle$, where $\boldsymbol{Y}$. By definition, this would be expressed as

$$\langle x_1\cdots x_n|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{Y})=\int d\boldsymbol{X}\ (x_1\cdots x_n)\ \mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Gamma}), \tag{A1}$$

where $\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{\Gamma})=\mathcal{P}(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{Y})$. For Gaussian variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x_1|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle_G&=\xi_\alpha^{x_1Y}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}Y_\beta\\ \langle x_1x_2|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle_G&=\xi^{x_1x_2}+\xi_\alpha^{x_1Y}\xi_\beta^{x_2Y}\left[\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\gamma}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\beta\delta}Y_\delta Y_\delta-\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

Using the cumulants expansion theorem, we could further expand to the weakly non-Gaussian field

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x_1|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle&\approx\langle x_1|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle_G+\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}_G^{-1}(\boldsymbol{Y})\left(\partial^{2Y}_{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{P}_G(\boldsymbol{Y})\right)\left[\xi^{x_1YY}_{\alpha\beta}-\left(\partial^Y_\gamma\langle x_1|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle_G\right)\right]\\ &=\langle x_1|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle_G+\frac{1}{2}\left[\xi^{x_1YY}_{\alpha\beta}-\xi^{YYY}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\xi^{x_1Y}_\kappa\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\kappa\gamma}\right]\left[\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\lambda}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\beta\tau}Y_\lambda Y_\tau-\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x_1x_2|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle&\approx\langle x_1x_2|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle_G\left[1+\frac{1}{3!}\xi^Y_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{P}_G^{-1}(\boldsymbol{Y})\left(\partial^{3Y}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{P}_G(\boldsymbol{Y})\right)\right]-\frac{1}{3!}\mathcal{P}_G^{-1}(\boldsymbol{Y})\int d\boldsymbol{X}(x_1x_2)\xi^\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\left(\partial^{3\Gamma}_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathcal{P}_G(\mathbf{\Gamma})\right)\\ &=\langle x_1x_2|\boldsymbol{Y}\rangle_G+\xi_\alpha^{x_1x_2Y}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}Y_\beta-\frac{1}{2}\left[\xi^{x_1YY}_{\alpha\beta}\xi^{x_2Y}_\gamma+\xi^{x_2YY}_{\alpha\beta}\xi^{x_1Y}_\gamma\right]\left[\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\gamma\delta}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\gamma}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\beta\tau}\right.\\ &\left.\times Y_\delta Y_\gamma Y_\tau-\left(\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\gamma}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\beta\delta}+\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\beta\gamma}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\delta}+\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\alpha\beta}\left(\xi^Y\right)^{-1}_{\gamma\delta}\right)Y_\delta\right].\end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

[1] P. J. E. Peebles, *The large-scale structure of the universe, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1980. 435 p.* (1980).
[2] F. Bernardeau, S. Colombi, E. Gaztañaga, and R. Scoccimarro, Physics Reports **367**, 1 (2002), astro-ph/0112551.
[3] M. H. Goroff, B. Grinstein, S.-J. Rey, and M. B. Wise, Astrophys. J. **311**, 6 (1986).
[4] B. Jain and E. Bertschinger, Astrophys. J. **431**, 495 (1994), astro-ph/9311070.
[5] N. Makino, M. Sasaki, and Y. Suto, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 585 (1992).
[6] M. Crocce and R. Scoccimarro, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 063519 (2006), astro-ph/0509418.
[7] E. Lawrence, K. Heitmann, M. White, D. Higdon, C. Wagner, S. Habib, and B. Williams, Astrophys. J. **713**, 1322 (2010), arXiv:0912.4490 [astro-ph.CO].
[8] K. Heitmann, E. Lawrence, J. Kwan, S. Habib, and D. Higdon, Astrophys. J. **780**, 111 (2014), arXiv:1304.7849.
[9] M. Crocce and R. Scoccimarro, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 063520 (2006), astro-ph/0509419.
[10] M. Crocce, R. Scoccimarro, and F. Bernardeau, MNRAS **427**, 2537 (2012), arXiv:1207.1465.
[11] M. Crocce and R. Scoccimarro, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 023533 (2008), arXiv:0704.2783.
[12] F. Bernardeau, M. Crocce, and R. Scoccimarro, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 123519 (2012), arXiv:1112.3895 [astro-ph.CO].
[13] F. Bernardeau, M. Crocce, and R. Scoccimarro, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 103521 (2008), arXiv:0806.2334.
[14] T. Matsubara, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 063530 (2008), arXiv:0711.2521.

[15] T. Okamura, A. Taruya, and T. Matsubara, JCAP **8**, 012 (2011), arXiv:1105.1491.
[16] T. Matsubara, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 083519 (2008), arXiv:0807.1733.
[17] T. Matsubara, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 083518 (2011), arXiv:1102.4619 [astro-ph.CO].
[18] X. Wang and A. Szalay, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 043508 (2012), arXiv:1204.0019.
[19] T. Matsubara, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 043537 (2014), arXiv:1304.4226.
[20] J. Carlson, M. White, and N. Padmanabhan, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 043531 (2009), arXiv:0905.0479 [astro-ph.CO].
[21] S. Anselmi and M. Pietroni, JCAP **12**, 013 (2012), arXiv:1205.2235.
[22] D. Blas, M. Garny, and T. Konstandin, JCAP **9**, 024 (2013), arXiv:1304.1546.
[23] D. Baumann, A. Nicolis, L. Senatore, and M. Zaldarriaga, JCAP **7**, 051 (2012), arXiv:1004.2488.
[24] J. J. M. Carrasco, M. P. Hertzberg, and L. Senatore, Journal of High Energy Physics **9**, 82 (2012), arXiv:1206.2926 [astro-ph.CO].
[25] M. P. Hertzberg, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 043521 (2014), arXiv:1208.0839.
[26] E. Pajer and M. Zaldarriaga, JCAP **8**, 037 (2013), arXiv:1301.7182.
[27] J. J. M. Carrasco, S. Foreman, D. Green, and L. Senatore, JCAP **7**, 056 (2014), arXiv:1304.4946.
[28] J. J. M. Carrasco, S. Foreman, D. Green, and L. Senatore, JCAP **7**, 057 (2014), arXiv:1310.0464.
[29] T. Baldauf, L. Mercolli, and M. Zaldarriaga, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 123007 (2015), arXiv:1507.02256.
[30] R. A. Porto, L. Senatore, and M. Zaldarriaga, JCAP **5**, 022 (2014), arXiv:1311.2168.
[31] L. Senatore and M. Zaldarriaga, JCAP **2**, 013 (2015), arXiv:1404.5954.
[32] T. Baldauf, L. Mercolli, M. Mirbabayi, and E. Pajer, JCAP **5**, 007 (2015), arXiv:1406.4135.
[33] R. E. Angulo, S. Foreman, M. Schmittfull, and L. Senatore, JCAP **10**, 039 (2015), arXiv:1406.4143.
[34] V. Assassi, D. Baumann, D. Green, and M. Zaldarriaga, JCAP **8**, 056 (2014), arXiv:1402.5916.
[35] J. R. Bond, S. Cole, G. Efstathiou, and N. Kaiser, Astrophys. J. **379**, 440 (1991).
[36] A. R. Zentner, International Journal of Modern Physics D **16**, 763 (2007), astro-ph/0611454.
[37] D. Blas, M. Garny, M. M. Ivanov, and S. Sibiryakov, ArXiv e-prints (2015), arXiv:1512.05807.
[38] D. Blas, M. Garny, M. M. Ivanov, and S. Sibiryakov, JCAP **7**, 028 (2016), arXiv:1605.02149.
[39] X. Wang and A. Szalay, Astrophys. J. **820**, 30 (2016), arXiv:1601.02675.
[40] J. M. Chambers, Biometrika **54**, 367 (1967).
[41] R. Juszkiewicz, D. H. Weinberg, P. Amsterdamski, M. Chodorowski, and F. Bouchet, Astrophys. J. **442**, 39 (1995), astro-ph/9308012.
[42] L. Amendola, MNRAS **283**, 983 (1996).
[43] S. Blinnikov and R. Moessner, Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement **130**, 193 (1998), astro-ph/9711239.
[44] C. Pichon and F. Bernardeau, Astronomy and Astrophysics **343**, 663 (1999), astro-ph/9902142.
[45] X. Wang, A. Szalay, M. A. Aragón-Calvo, M. C. Neyrinck, and G. L. Eyink, Astrophys. J. **793**, 58 (2014), arXiv:1309.5305.
[46] S. Pueblas and R. Scoccimarro, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 043504 (2009), arXiv:0809.4606.